# HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 46 Monday, November 17, 1958 Washington, D. C.

**News Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

**REPUBLICANS:** *The key to victory*.....(page 1)
**ROCKEFELLER:** *Shocks the Capital*.....(page 2)
**SPENDING:** *When the voters said "no"*.....(page 3)
**HIGH COURT:** *The battle resumes*.....(page 3)
**SPECIAL:** *A program for the GOP*.....(page 4)

**Re-forming the Ranks:** Republican conservatives on Capitol Hill, far from being crushed, as asserted by the usual choir of "liberal" columnists, actually are showing intense activity in "reconstruction" planning, and are busy creating an "order of battle" for the coming struggle in Congress.

Keynote for the next bugle charge is sounded in the searching remark of a former Senator, an old friend of the defeated Senator John Bricker, one of the outstanding casualties of the election. "John's campaign managers," said his old colleague, "failed to follow the course of Bob Taft, in his historic re-election victory of 1950." What this remark means draws ready agreement from Capitol Hill. Taft had been marked for slaughter by the labor bosses, in revenge for his leadership in gaining passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. Taft foresaw what was coming and, early in 1949 began to forge, by infinite industry, a formidable organization of conservatives in his state.

*He formed a Labor League for Taft, composed of 11,000 carefully selected local labor-union figures in all Ohio counties. Their identities remained well-concealed until just before election date, when—blitz-fashion—they came out with public appeals to the rank and filers, urging them to back Taft. In short, Taft did not just appeal vocally to the rank and file over the heads of the bosses; he insured, by organization, that they would be sparked into action at the polls by local union members.*

Bricker did not do this a year ago and, although he worked hard in recent months, simply did not possess the requisite machinery to tap rank-and-file union members. (In justice to Bricker, he is an older man than Taft was in 1950, and could not draw on the resources, financial and otherwise, which helped Taft.) As election experts in Washington see it, Knowland also went down to defeat because he failed to construct the necessary organization. Goldwater, on the other hand, "did the needful" and won a brilliant victory.

● In the same package as the election or defeat of GOP candidates is the right to work. The day after the votes were counted, superficial comment raised doubts about the practicality of the issue. More sober reflection in the past week, however, discouraged such inclinations. For one thing, the right to work made some forward progress—winning in one state, Kansas—and its great popularity in all 19 states where it is law insures it great vitality. Also, many business interests recognize that in the right-to-work states the industrial climate is infinitely better than in labor-dominated states like Michigan.

In any case, the issue appears likely to be a hot topic in the coming session of Congress, when the victorious labor bosses will seek to erase Section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act, which allows the states to pass right-to-work laws. This effort—which may well succeed—will rally the opposition of strong forces in the right-to-work states to repel this endeavor of the labor union hierarchy to make compulsory unionism "the law of the land."

Such an eventuality dismays political strategists in the Capital, who have regarded right to work as an invaluable means by which they could summon up political support from the masses of workers. Actually, most employers derive little immediate benefit from passage of right-to-work laws. The direct beneficiary is the "little man," the individual trade union member who obtains some protection from the dictatorial and corrupt practices of the bosses.

For all such reasons, the considered admonition on right to work is "the fight has just begun." That slogan implies (1) that the case for the measure must be propagated widely and intelligently and (2) that political organization must be forged to win the battle at the polls.

**Young Conservatives:** HUMAN EVENTS has made a study of the election's effect upon the younger conservatives among the Republican Members of the House of Representatives. (Members of Congress are classified as follows: the older bracket, 65 and over. Middle-aged, 55 to 65. Younger members, 55 and under.)

**HUMAN EVENTS for October 20, 1958, listed 42 Republicans, 55 years of age or younger, as "Roll of Honor" conservatives. They had cast more than 70 per cent of their votes on controversial issues against the recommendations of ADA. Of the 42, 38 sought re-election and 34 won.**

This high proportion (89.5 per cent) of "young" conservative victors is reassuring to the GOP, for it runs contrary to normal expectations. An opposition "sweep" usually causes the most devastating losses among the younger and newer members because they are the ones who lack the prestige and power which comes with high seniority in committees. In addition, they have not had as many years in which to be of service to constituents.

The 34 were: Rhodes (Ariz.); Teague, Jackson, Hosmer, Smith, Holt, Lipscomb, Wilson (Calif.); Cramer (Fla.); Budge (Idaho); Collier (Ill.); Adair (Ind.);

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. ● Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McIntire (Me.); Bates (Mass.); Johansen, Cederberg (Mich.); Weaver, Cunningham (Nebr.); Derounian, Bosch, Robison, Miller, Pillion (N.Y.); Jonas (N.C.); Scherer, Betts, Henderson, Minshall (Ohio); Alger (Tex.); Poff (Va.); Van Pelt, Laird, Byrnes (Wis.); and Thomson (Wyo.).

**Election and Recession:** Although analysts seem agreed that the recession played a big role in what they call the Democratic tide, the election polls in two key industrial states—Michigan and Pennsylvania—show that this thesis should be qualified in some respects.

● *Michigan (with the highest unemployment rate of any state—14.4 per cent of the work force, in the latest official tally) has had New Deal Governor "Soapy" Williams, protégé of Walter Reuther, for five full terms. The Reuther-Williams combination left no oratorical stone unturned in lining up the voters for the state Democratic ticket, showed no inhibitions in promising voters the sky as the limit in nostrums for curing the recession. Yet, when the votes were counted Soapy failed to lead his ticket, which he had always led in the past. His margin of 136,000 (53 per cent of the vote) over the Republican candidate, Professor Bagwell, was regarded in Michigan as very disappointing to the ambitious Governor. Indeed, some press comments already draw the conclusion that the result dooms Soapy's Presidential ambitions.*

Similarly, the Republicans lost just one Congressional candidate, Robert J. McIntosh of the Seventh District, who had served only since 1956. And GOP Representative Charles E. Chamberlain—of the Sixth (Flint-Lansing) District, filled with dues-paying members of Reuther's union—who had been marked for slaughter, won re-election.

Soapy's reduction in support, say Michigan observers, sprang in part from the spreading realization that the Reuther system in the Wolverine State was leading to a permanent recession, even before 1957. This trend was described and documented in the HUMAN EVENTS article, "Walter's Boy Soapy," by Frank C. Hanighen (October 13, 1958).

● As for Pennsylvania, political observers in that state are still astonished at the small margin of victory achieved by David Lawrence, the Democratic candidate for Governor. Lawrence defeated his opponent, Arthur McGonigle, by only 85,000 votes out of a total of nearly two million, getting only 51.1 per cent of the total vote. He made a disappointing showing in his home town of Pittsburgh, where he has served as Mayor, but he did better in Philadelphia. He had been widely classified as an easy winner. Democratic Governor George Leader was defeated—as was also predicted—by GOP Representative Hugh Scott. Leader had piled up a large number of malcontents in his party because of various policies he had pursued as Governor.

Scott, a Modern Republican, was chosen by the state GOP after conservative GOP Representative Richard Simpson firmly declined to make the race. Simpson prizes his long seniority in the House, and many in Washington think of him as some day becoming Speaker. The narrowing margin by which Scott had won re-election in his Congressional district in recent years perhaps prompted him to go for the Senate instead of staking his future in his own district. Political observers in Philadelphia believe that—in view of the split Democratic party situation as to Governor Leader—Simpson would have won if he had chosen to bid for the Senatorial seat.

**Rockefeller:** The serio-comic spectacle of Harold Stassen, despite his perennial and humiliating defeats, trying to grab the spotlight to revive his feud with Nixon, has aroused much mirth in the Capital. Many feel, however, that Stassen pointed up the developing rivalry of Nelson Rockefeller and Nixon for the Presidential nomination in 1960.

Nelson, meanwhile, celebrated his victory and his vacation in Maracaibo, Venezuela, by delivering himself of an astonishing remark to the Venezuelan press, which has been widely reprinted in the United States. In answer to a query about Vice President Nixon, upon his arrival at the Caracas airport, Rockefeller said: "I have nothing to do with Nixon." Washington is shocked, and it is believed people in the grass roots are shocked as well, for it was at this very same field, six months ago, that Venezuelan Reds greeted Nixon with sticks, stones and spittle. The fact is that Nixon nearly lost his life at the hands of the frenzied left-wing mob.

**Never in history, Washington observes, had the honor of the United States been so affronted; never anywhere had an American Vice President received such criminal insults. Yet, a man popularly supposed to be a prominent contender for the highest office in the land chose to disassociate himself blatantly from the Vice President in the very locale where American honor was the object of literal expectoration by foreigners.**

Around the Capital, this stunning incident fortifies the impression long current here that Nelson Rockefeller is a "liberal" dilettante of the "let's keep apologizing for the US" stripe, a one-worlder and—from the observation of those who know his work in the Federal Government—a follower of the ineffable Harold Stassen, in the latter's visionary international schemes.

● Canvassing opinion in New York City, political observers come up with the conclusion that Anna Rosenberg, rather than former Governor Thomas E. Dewey, maneuvered Nelson Rockefeller into the Governor's chair in Albany. Mrs. Rosenberg—an extreme left-winger—has served as public relations counsel to the Rockefellers for years and was Nelson's close adviser before and during the recent gubernatorial campaign. Dewey—also, in a sense, an employee of Rockefeller interests, since he is a legal counsel for the Chase-Manhattan Bank—was also helpful, but mainly in getting rid of opposition to Rockefeller in the GOP.

Because of her friendly relations with left-wingers in the Democratic party and with New York's ADA-ing Liberal party, Mrs. Rosenberg is credited with splitting the traditional Democratic support of Harriman, of pitting the "liberals" against machine boss de Sapio (which resulted in the latter "knifing" Harriman). At



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same time, she reportedly split off many Democrats among the needle-trades unions from Harriman, and helped produce the eleventh-hour switch of *New York Post* Publisher Dorothy Schiff, repudiating Harriman. In short, Mrs. Rosenberg manipulated left-wing contradictions so cleverly that she provided Rockefeller with much of his New York City vote.

**Add Celebrants:** Prominent among those who kicked up their heels over the Democratic election victory this month were the accredited spokesmen of the world Communist conspiracy. Soviet Dictator Nikita Khrushchev, reported the Baltimore *Sun*, "thinks the Democrats are more likely to be friendly toward the Soviet Union than the Republicans have been." The congressional vote, Khrushchev averred, "condemned the Dulles policy of strength which is supported by Mr. Eisenhower."

In America, *The Worker*, official mouthpiece of the Communist party USA, made clear its pleasure at the outcome of the balloting, and added this observation: "The November 4 results would have been more emphatic had the Democrats generally advanced the criticism of the Administration's policy that was heard from former Senator Lehman, Senator Morse and others."

**High Court:** Contention over the leftist antics of the US Supreme Court bobbed to the surface in the wake of the elections. In a speech delivered in Augusta, Georgia, last week, Senator Strom Thurmond (D.-S.C.) flayed the Court's campaign to force school integration in the South. "We are not about to surrender," Thurmond said, "now or in the future. Instead, we hereby declare total and unremitting war on the Supreme Court's unconstitutional usurpations and unlawful arrogations of power." The Senator added that the South would supply "an adequate system of mass education for all our people —either a public system or a private system."

Two days later, speaking at Columbia University Law School in New York, left-wing Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas signified that he and his Court colleagues were unrepentant, and intended to press forward with their present course in integration and internal security matters. The High Court, Douglas said, would not "take a back seat" to Congress and the Executive.

**Bound Volumes for 1957**—indexed—may now be ordered for March delivery. Regularly $15. The special pre-publication price of $7.50 will be accepted until December 31. These handsome volumes make a valuable addition to your library. Volumes for 1956 and 1957 available at regular price.

**Spending and Taxes:** While politicans argue over the meaning of the election, statisticians here point out that the American public—whatever its reasons for repudiating the GOP—does not knowingly vote for heavy spending. For, obscured by the attention-getting Federal races were innumerable local and state-wide bond issues, referenda and proposed constitutional amendments which would have added to the tax burden—but which were defeated by an economy-conscious public.

Detroit defeated both a $7.1 million port development plan and a proposal to raise taxes. Illinois turned down a $75 million Korean War veterans' bonus issue. Cleveland defeated a $20 million civic center plan, and Pittsburgh rejected a bond issue to expand prison facilities.

*Across the Potomac from the Capital, voters in Arlington County, Virginia, overwhelmingly defeated a proposal to create a redevelopment and housing authority there. The plan was aimed at getting Federal funds for "urban renewal" in "blighted" business areas. Arkansas repealed the state government's authority to levy a property tax. By a three-to-one vote, Texans rejected a proposed constitutional amendment which would have involved increasing the pay of state legislators.*

North Dakota defeated a constitutional amendment to permit additional property taxes, and Montgomery County, Alabama, rejected a proposed school tax increase. Also in Alabama, referenda to increase local debt limits and to increase levy limits were defeated.

Four amendments that would have permitted the state to collect additional real estate taxes were killed in Georgia. In the Northwest, Oregon turned down a measure allowing the state to build power plants and enter the power wholesaling business.

**Subversion:** Shunted aside in the election furor in recent weeks was a crucial news break relating to "McCarthyism" and the continuing fight against subversion in Government. The fortnightly magazine, *USA*, revealed that official Government hearings prove Mrs. Annie Lee Moss, alleged by "liberals" to be a victim of false accusations by Senator McCarthy, was in fact a "dues-paying, card-carrying member of the Communist party." This fact was disclosed by the Subversive Activities Control Board, in a hearing last month.

**Upon inspection of Communist party records, the SACB stated that "the situation that has resulted on the Moss question is that the party's own records, copies of which are now in evidence, and the authenticity of which it does not dispute . . . show an Annie Lee Moss, 72 R St., SW, Washington, D. C., was a party member . . . " (The "martyred" Mrs. Moss told investigators that 72 R St., SW, was her address.)**

**Fat-Cat Bureaucrats:** A House subcommittee last week issued an angry report, revealing one reason why the Federal Budget—along with galloping inflation—has reached record proportions: "A hard core of self-generating Federal jobholders, with built-in resistance to legislative efforts to hold payrolls within reason." The report added that "increased employment and higher salaries brought about by past emergencies have left in their wake new plateaus for public employment and salaries after the emergency no longer exists."

Representative James C. Davis (D.-Ga.), economy-minded chairman of the subcommittee, found that "in 1942 we had 11,000 classified employees in grades 13 [whose salaries have more than doubled in the interim, to reach the present range of $9890-$11,090] and above. Today we have 56,000. . . . At the low end of our grade structure the reverse has taken place. The number of personnel in grades 1 and 2 [now paying about $3000-$3500 annually] has dropped since 1942 from 420,000 to 59,000." (Upgrading to raise salaries is one of the oldest rackets of the Washington bureaucracy.)



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A Program for the GOP

*By* POTOMACUS II

The American people gave the Republican party an assignment in 1952 to restore sanity and integrity to Government, and to work for fiscal responsibility, states' rights and a firm and honorable foreign policy. The record demonstrates that the Republican Administration failed to fulfill its obligations, that it betrayed the trust and confidence placed in it by the American people and that as a consequence the Republicans "paid the piper" on November 4.

With the exception of one or two Senate contests, local conditions were the dominant factors in the balloting. And with the single exception of Beall of Maryland, "me too," "internationalist" and "modern" incumbents were retired from the upper chamber.

Conservative Senators Barrett and Bricker were defeated. In my opinion this was not a matter of fundamental philosophy, but of local and organizational conditions. Knowland went down to defeat also, but there are special California reasons for that.

The left-wingers don't want to talk about Goldwater or Williams. Pray tell, what happened to Purtell, Potter, Payne, Thye, Watkins and Revercomb? All good "moderns" or White House "coattail riders"—as well as Malone, who on labor legislation and the crucial issue of the Supreme Court had strayed from conservatism. The election confirmed the definition of Modern Republicanism subscribed to by the author, namely that *Modern Republicans are officials who have to be appointed, since they cannot be elected under their own steam.*

The following suggestions are addressed to those who adhere to basic GOP principles:

1. *We have in the Senate of the United States what might be called an elite corps of responsible Republicans —amounting to approximately 21 of the remaining 34 nominal members of the GOP in the upper house.*

2. On the Democratic side of the Senate there are at least 15 men who basically adhere to the conservative philosophy.

3. *With these 36 Senators who truly believe in the same political principles, we can accomplish more in the coming two years than we did formerly with the watered-down larger group which professed to sail under our colors.*

4. It is time for the Senate Republicans to meet in caucus and find out who desires to fight and who prefers to remain aloof from the coming struggle. There is no place at the present time for any vacillation or equivocation. A floor leader must be chosen who intends to fight for Republicanism, rather than for the Administration.

5. *For the first time a true coalition can be arranged with the Southern conservatives. It must be done on a ruthless quid pro quo basis. Too often have Southern legislators lost interest in conservative principles, once their regional considerations were taken care of.*

This time the Southerners have no place to go and they ought to be so advised. The first order of business of the new Congress will be the revision of Rule 22, rapidly followed by implementation of "civil rights" legislation, and before the first dogwood blooms the hounds will be baying for the abolition of depletion allowances. Lyndon Johnson must be told that there are no oil wells and few Negroes in New Hampshire and Iowa, and that if he desires help he is going to have to *give* some.

6. *Republicans might just as well decide that whether or not they still "like Ike" they had better "stick with Dick" or they will end up with "Nels." The "infighting" on this issue is going to be rough. We have an advantage if we decide what we want and are willing to fight for it. If Rockefeller wins the Republican nomination in 1960, what choice will the voters have?*

To the business community there must be addressed one brief comment. You are now squarely under the gun. You can no longer afford the luxury of buying your eldest boy a $5000 auto so that he can date the campus queen and then contribute a bare $50 to the political party which has the only hope of protecting the boy's life and destiny. The time has come either to put your money where your mouth is or to stop squawking about taxes, inflation and socialism.

This is not a time for despondency. In fact, it is very analogous to things which the author observed in World War II. The British have a commonplace comment which is instructive. Leaving aside the human suffering and loss of life, one of the most constructive things that ever happened to London, paradoxically, was the terrific bombing it received. The English were forced to rebuild areas which should have been torn down years ago, and which they never had the courage to raze and replace. With a few courageous leaders and the backing of some intelligent members of the business community we can now perform a similar work on the Republican party.


**52 WAYS**
**TO SAY MERRY CHRISTMAS**
**and A HAPPY NEW YEAR!**

**Take just a few minutes, and write down the names and addresses of the friends to whom you want to send Christmas gifts.**

**Then solve your Christmas gift problem by sending them HUMAN EVENTS, the gift that will remind them of you 52 times a year.**

**Two or more three-month subscriptions, $2.50 each; two or more six-month subscriptions, $5 each; two or more annual subscriptions, $9 each.**


**EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Member of Congress from California:** "I can thank HUMAN EVENTS for my being in Congress today. I received a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS when it was started and have been a subscriber ever since."


**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.**

**Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.**

**By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.**

**Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.**

**For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

**The Declaration of Independence opens: "When, in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."**

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* — JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*




PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 17, 1958

**Article Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

**General Albert C. Wedemeyer served as commander of US forces in the China Theater during the years 1944-46, and also as Chief of Staff to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The famous "Wedemeyer Report"—his 1947 survey of Chinese and Korean affairs, delivered to President Truman—opposed the sellout of those vital areas to Communist Governments under the direction of Moscow. It was covered up until inquiring Senate investigators forced its disclosure.**

This article is adapted from the new book, *Wedemeyer Reports*, released this week. The contents are copyrighted by General Wedemeyer, and reprinted by permission of the publisher, Henry Holt & Co. The book may be obtained, for the bookstore price of $6, from The Bookmailer, Box 101 Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.

# APPEASEMENT IN CHINA: WHERE IT LEADS

## An Inside Account by a Top Expert on Asia

*By* General Albert C. Wedemeyer

On October 27, 1944, while lying in my bunk at Kandy, Ceylon, I received my order from General Marshall to hold myself in readiness to depart for China. I had been deeply immersed in my duties in India, where I had been Deputy Supreme Commander under Lord Louis Mountbatten, so my new double assignment as Commander of US troops in China and Chief of Staff to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek came as a bombshell.

I knew that I faced a problem akin to "untangling a can of worms," which was General Dan Sultan's description of what faced me. As I flew into China over the Hump at 21,000-foot altitude, I reviewed what I knew of the situation. There was, as I had been told by Sultan and others, the dissension caused by the long-standing antagonism between General Joseph Stilwell, the overall US Commander in the China-Burma theater, and General Claire Chennault, the creator of the famous Flying Tigers, who was in charge of the Fourteenth Air Force in China. But this, I had already conjectured to my aide, Captain William McAfee, was only the immediate cause of the difficulties. The fundamental reason for Stilwell's recall and my sudden promotion to a job I was loath to take (China was known as a graveyard for American officials) was "Vinegar Joe's" extreme antagonism to Chiang Kai-shek.

I recalled the description of Chiang ("coolie class," prone to "tantrums," "incompetent") as I had heard it from Stilwell's own vehement lips in Marshall's office in Washington. I recalled, too, his hard words about Chennault's "intrigues." As General Marshall's strategic "planner," I was not disposed to doubt my chief's high opinion of Stilwell at the time. Since then I had heard a good deal more about Stilwell's difficulties with both Chennault and the Generalissimo. When I visited with Chennault on my first evening in Kunming after dropping down through the rain and overcast on the inner side of the Hump, the old Flying Tiger's objectivity contrasted strongly with my memory of Stilwell's diatribes against anyone sharing authority with him.

I had already met Chiang Kai-shek on a wartime flight around the world in 1943. Now, on the occasion of my first official call on the Generalissimo after I had assumed the China command, I was impressed all over again by this small, graceful, fine-boned man with black, piercing eyes and an engaging smile.

As I learned more about Chiang, I realized that his course in holding out against the Japanese from 1937 to 1944 expressed a spirit even more gallant than Churchill's famous "blood, sweat and tears" speech after Dunkirk. Chiang had all along been fighting a war on four fronts: against the Japanese; against Russia in the person of the Chinese Communists; against the centrifugal forces in China, represented by former war lords or semi-independent provincial governors and generals; *and* against the "Western imperialists," meaning in particular the British, whom, thanks to their strategy of self-interest, he had no reason to trust. Chiang's greatness and weakness lay in the fact that he never lost sight of the original objective of the Kuomintang, namely, the unification and independence of China. Paradoxically, it was the Communists who benefitted by the fact that the political unity of China was conserved by Chiang Kai-shek.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naturally, the Generalissimo, knowing that he could do little to win the war as long as aid from America had been reduced to a trickle, hoped to refrain from provoking the Japanese to advance any further in Chinese territory. This led to the false charge (made by John Davies and others) that a *modus vivendi* had been worked out between the Nationalists and Japan. General Stilwell's reports to Marshall did nothing to combat the charge. When I went to the American Embassy in Chungking to pay my respects to Ambassador Gauss, who was shortly to be replaced by the colorful Pat Hurley, I was shocked to hear him say: "We should pull up the plug and let the whole Chinese Government go down the drain."

Such an attitude, which had been sedulously fostered by Stilwell's four State Department political advisers, John Davies, John Service, Raymond Ludden and John Emerson, all of whom I inherited, became more and more incomprehensible to me the longer I stayed in China. Although I locked up the papers relating to the relief of Stilwell in a file called "Oklahoma" (named after Pat Hurley's native state), where they remained unread until after the war, I soon discovered that no Chinese Communist forces had ever fought in any major engagement against the Japanese. The Communists, wrongly called "agrarians" and "Jeffersonians," simply played the role of jackal or hyena against the wounded and suffering Chinese elephant who would not submit to his enemy.

In discussing communism with Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai I raised the point of their prior loyalty to the Soviet Union. Chou En-lai, who quoted Lenin and Marx in a most un-agrarian way, replied that the Chinese Communists—or "liberators"—could not be separated from the socialist mother state nor could they operate without the aid of both the international proletariat and the Soviet Union. My meeting with Mao and Chou En-lai gave the lie to reports that the Chinese Communists were simply agrarian reformers interested in the welfare of the people.

Stilwell had a reputation for being a fine fighting man. Obviously he could inspire troops. I do not doubt that he loved the Chinese soldier or that he was a capable division commander. But, despite his criticism of Chiang for not prosecuting the war against Japan with unity and vigor, Stilwell himself had no concept for bringing about a coordinated, decisive effort against the Japanese. When I asked General Hearn to outline Stilwell's operational plans to me after my arrival in China, he said he was not familiar with them because "the old man had carried such information in his hip pocket."

Hearn tried to tell me that there was no use discussing things with the Chinese at Chiang's headquarters. Using honey instead of vinegar, however, I discovered Chiang was eminently willing to accede to planning in which he had primarily an onlooker's part.

In my insistence on honest and open cooperation with Chiang, I had a hundred cross-currents with which to contend. Pat Hurley, the new ambassador, confused the issue for me on one occasion by lumping my own Chief of Staff, General McClure, with John Davies and John Service as saboteurs of his efforts to secure Communist troops for use against Japan along with the Nationalist armies. I had known General McClure for 20 years. If Hurley, whose temporary outburst of hostility deeply grieved me, had not unjustly impugned the loyalty of McClure, I would have paid more attention to his entirely justified suspicion of John Davies and John Stewart Service and my other State Department advisers.

**Today, reading through the reports sent to me and to the State Department by Davies, Service, Emerson and Ludden, it seems obvious not only that their sympathies lay with the Chinese Communists, but also that they were either consciously or unwittingly disseminating exaggerated or false, Communist-inspired, reports concerning the Nationalist Government. These reports were designed to stir up all manner of Sino-American distrust—as, for instance, when John Davies sent me long accounts of rumors or unsubstantiated reports that the Generalissimo was collaborating with the Japanese.**

JOHN DAVIES had not been content to press for aid to the Communists. In one of his secret reports, dated December 12, 1944, he went so far as to recommend that the US cut off supplies to the Nationalist armies unless they ceased fighting to contain Communist forces. He obviously wanted us to make a Mikhailovitch out of Chiang Kai-shek. In another report John Davies wrote that although "we should not now abandon Chiang Kai-shek," because for the moment we would "lose more than we could gain," we should "have no qualms in ultimately abandoning him in favor of the progressive—Communist—forces in China."

At Hurley's insistence, Davies was recalled by the State Department. Subsequently he was transferred to Moscow, where (as Pat said to me) one could hope that "John would experience at first hand the chicanery as well as the tyranny of communism." Later I received a letter from Mr. Davies in Moscow, insisting that he had never accepted communism as a philosophy of life. Because of my own 1941 experience with certain people in Washington who tried to spread the canard that I was a pro-Nazi merely because I had studied at the German War College and had opposed our entry into the war, I was on all



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occasions meticulous in my remarks about Davies, Service and others in China. But it was no exaggeration to say that they were hypercritical of the Nationalists and commendatory toward the Reds.

Our basic attitude toward China, after Pearl Harbor, was one of a completely unrealistic impatience. We chivvied and harassed Chiang Kai-shek for not doing more to "ease pressure on the United States and the British Commonwealth in the Pacific." No word of recognition of the gallant fight which China had waged against Japan all alone during four and a half years, during the greater part of which period both England and the United States continued to sell the sinews of war to Japan. No word to China that henceforth, having been attacked ourselves, we would come to her aid. To complete the picture, after the US Navy's defeat of the Japanese at Leyte Gulf and Stalin's promise in October, 1944, that 60 Soviet divisions would be available for operations against Japan three months after Germany's defeat, the British-American Joint Chiefs of Staff lost all interest in China's war effort.

I knew that a civil war in China would destroy the economic and political equilibrium in the Far East. It was my hope in expressing this view to General Marshall that President Truman and Stalin would jointly agree to avoid interference in the internal affairs of China. Realizing that my Government would not give Chiang the logistical and arms aid he must have to take over Manchuria, and also that the Chinese Nationalist Government unaided would not have the strength to re-establish its authority over North China if it also attempted to occupy Manchuria, I suggested to the Generalissimo that the Chinese Government propose a temporary five-power guardianship over Manchuria by the United States, Great Britain, France, China and the Soviet Union. At the same time I recommended to Chiang that he would be wise to send his best administrators as well as military leaders to North China, south of the Great Wall, to insure that his control there would be firmly established.

Chiang did not accept my recommendations, and, in any event, my advice would surely have been ignored in Washington. We were still in the sunset period of the "Trust Uncle Joe" epoch. Having rushed into the war for the kill only eight days before Japan's surrender (very much as Mussolini had attacked the prostrate body of France in 1940), the Red Army met practically no enemy resistance and was soon in complete control of Manchuria. The Russians immediately proceeded to dismantle all removable industrial equipment and destroyed most of the rest. It seemed strange that they should destroy installations that their own Chinese Communist forces might use. I came to the conclusion that the reason for their seemingly illogical behavior was that the Kremlin leaders never dreamed the United States would be so supine as to permit them to remain in Manchuria or enable the Chinese Communists to take it over.

*I was needled by Communist-sympathizing American and other correspondents concerning the help I was giving the Nationalists, under cover of my directive to arrange for the repatriation of the Japanese. But to me it seemed that we had a moral obligation to give China the necessary political, military and economic support to insure that Soviet Russia would not be able with impunity to ignore her pledges in the treaty we had practically compelled China to sign. Moreover, it was obviously in our national interest to keep China from becoming a Soviet satellite. Hence my effort to contain the Communists by interpreting vague and contradictory instructions in the most elastic fashion possible.*

MEANWHILE THE KREMLIN was not only denying the Chinese Nationalists access to Manchuria, but it was also busy supplying the Chinese Communist party with surrendered Japanese arms and equipment. I asked the War Department to send seven American divisions to China in order to create a barrier through North China and Manchuria against Soviet Russia. The Joint Chiefs replied that the divisions were not available. However, two Marine Corps divisions were sent out. I disposed them from Peiping to the sea, including the Shantung Peninsula within their area of protection.

During a brief visit to Washington I was directed by President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to write a report on China. The President and General Marshall felt that I should refrain from coming to definite conclusions, and asked for several alternative lines of action. Accordingly, I could do no more than make my views of the situation clear, while refraining from stating that only one course could preserve American interests, namely, unequivocal assistance to our ally, the Chinese Nationalist Government. Neither then, nor before, nor subsequently, did I receive a clear-cut directive from Washington.

In December, 1945, I received word from General Marshall that he had been requested by President Truman to serve as a special envoy to China and would arrive in Shanghai shortly. I met the General and accompanied him to the Cathay Hotel in Shanghai. He was unpacking his effects while we discussed plans for his first call on the Generalissimo. He showed me a copy of his directive from the President, which requested him to bring the Nationalists and the Communists together in a coalition Government. I told General Marshall that he would never be



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to effect a working agreement between the Communists and Nationalists, since the Nationalists, who still had most of the power, were determined not to relinquish one iota of it, while the Communists for their part were equally determined to seize all power, with the aid of the Soviet Union.

General Marshall reacted angrily and said, "I am going to accomplish my mission and you are going to help me."

That night I was in a quandary. I recalled that at the Casablanca Conference, Marshall had said: "You will be doing me a disservice if you do not always give me the benefit of your thinking." (This was after I had come out strongly in opposition to the doctrine of Unconditional Surrender.) I wondered what had happened to cause Marshall to assume his present aloofness, almost hostility, because I had spoken my mind frankly and freely. Although General Marshall later recommended my appointment as Ambassador to China, I felt certain that his concept of what American policy should be was not mine. As with Pat Hurley the year before, I knew there was no possibility of an accommodation between Nationalists and Chinese Communists.

Because of Communist pressure I was eventually turned down for the Ambassadorship. Tired of futile efforts in China, I requested home service. After a six-week vacation at Sanibel Island in Florida, I returned to army duty at Fort Meade, Maryland, far from the troubles of Asia. At the request of Secretary of Defense Jim Forrestal, however, I wrote a memorandum on China which widened the growing rift with my esteemed chief, General Marshall. Marshall, I said, had "tried to get a quick solution to the China problem" by mixing oil and water. I challenged the wisdom of this. I had been shocked by Marshall's eventual recommendation that my appointment as Ambassador to China be cancelled on account of Communist objections. Neither at this time nor later did I ever impugn Marshall's motives. But Marshall had never had either the time, inclination or opportunity to study the methods of communism; and he had implicitly believed the reports of his old friend, General Stilwell, who ascribed all the ills of China to the Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Moreover, by the time he arrived in China on his fatal mission, George Marshall was physically and mentally too worn out to appraise the situation correctly.

Taking issue with Marshall and State Department policy in my memorandum for Forrestal, I went on to say that Chiang could make progress toward the unification of China "if he had realistic American aid—not measured by bulk but by the wisdom with which it is applied and offered."

I should still esteem Marshall as one of the great men of our generation if he had ever acknowledged his fatal mistake in China, namely, maintaining that the Nationalists and Communists were simply two factions contending for power and that he was therefore justified in embargoing all arms and ammunition supplies to China in 1946-47 in order to force Chiang to come to terms with the Communists. (In defending the Marshall position, Dean Acheson was either misinformed or was deliberately misleading Congress when he cited "our military observers on the spot" as authority for his statement that Chiang had lost no battles for lack of arms and ammunition.)

Marshall's mistake carried over into the period of my last mission to the Orient in 1947. I was told to write my own directive for the mission, but I fear that this was merely a "cover" for Washington skulduggery. My subsequent recommendations—that the United States, through the offices of the United Nations, give material aid to Chiang for post-war rehabilitation, and that a guardianship be instituted over Manchuria to keep it from being "drawn into the Soviet orbit"—were ignored. My report was simply buried until, in due time, it was exhumed by Senate Committee investigators who had become alarmed at the imminent loss of China to the Communists.

*The State Department's "let the dust settle" policy rendered inevitable the Communist conquest of China. The Chinese people are realists. They became so disheartened and demoralized by our attitude that they finally ceased to resist the Communists. What reason could there be for continuing to oppose them if even America wanted China to come to terms with them?*

**HUMAN EVENTS** was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.**

**ORDER BLANK**

**HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.**

Send me _____ reprints of "APPEASEMENT IN CHINA: WHERE IT LEADS" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED